

To: **Richmond County Heritage Advisory Committee**
Richmond County Council

From: **Planning Staff (EDPC)**

Date: **DATE**

Reference: **Municipal Heritage Property Designation Scoring Criteria**

Recommendation:

That the score sheet and scoring guide provided in Appendix A be implemented to evaluate municipal heritage registration requests.

Background:

The Municipality of the County of Richmond has recently received two requests to register municipal heritage properties.

Richmond County has adopted a *Heritage Property By-law* pursuant to the *Heritage Property Act*, which allows the municipality to recognize buildings, properties, and other areas for their heritage value. The registration and protection of heritage properties offers benefits to the property owner, the municipality, and the community. Heritage designation can increase property values, create a sense of community image and pride, create opportunities in the tourism industry, promote sustainability, and enhance the local environment in terms of aesthetic value and education about the past.

The By-law provides protection by implementing an application process for proposed alterations and demolitions of heritage properties. Pursuant to the By-law, Council has the authority to approve or refuse applications with or without conditions. Should an application be refused by the Municipality, the owner may make the alteration or carry out the demolition at any time after three years from the date of the application.

Requests for heritage registration are first heard by the Heritage Advisory Committee, which provides advice to municipal Council. Properties are ultimately designated by Council. The property owner has the opportunity to be heard before a decision is rendered.

When faced with heritage registration requests, many municipalities employ a set of criteria to score the property. Scoring criteria can help guide the Committee and Council in making decisions about which properties have significant heritage value and the character-defining elements that warrant protection. The scoring of properties also ensures that a given evaluation is as consistent and objective as possible.

Analysis:

Staff have carried out a jurisdictional scan and best practices review. Many scoring systems appear to be based loosely on Harold Kalman's "Evaluation of Historic Buildings" (1979), which is widely used in conservation work within Canada. Kalman breaks evaluations down into five categories: history, architecture, environment, useability, and integrity. Point values are awarded for each criterion, where the more points a property scores the more heritage value it is deemed to possess. Some municipalities use a cut-off value where properties should score a minimum number of points in order to be designated.

History

The history category evaluates whether the community views the property as having significant associations. This might include whether the building is associated with persons, groups, organizations, events, or institutions that are significant to the community. The strength of the connection is also evaluated. For example, a building which was the primary residence of a significant individual should receive more points than one which was only occupied for a short time. This category can also include whether the property is illustrative of cultural, social, political, or other types of history. A good example is the LeNoir Forge, which is valued for its strong association with the shipbuilding industry in Arichat (Appendix B).

Architecture

The architecture category measures the intrinsic value of physical structures. The criteria address the style, design, and construction of buildings and other structures. Properties which are particularly early, unique, or impressive examples of each criterion are scored highly. Age is also considered. While age alone is not a good determining factor, one of the goals of preservation is to recognize and maintain connections to the community's past. Points can also be assigned based on knowledge of, and the significance of, the architect or builder themselves.

Environment

This category looks at the property in the context of the current streetscape and wider community. A property may contribute to the dominant character of the streetscape, or may stand out as a symbol or landmark. A good test to evaluate the environment criteria is to imagine the building were removed and consider how the streetscape would be impacted.

Useability

Useability looks to the future and considers the potential of the property. Buildings which are vacant for long periods of time are more likely to fall into disrepair. This category considers whether the current use is compatible with the area, the property can be adaptively reused without harming the heritage value, and if there are adequate services and utilities in place. Useability is not often included in scoring systems in practice, likely because it does not capture

the actual current heritage value. For that reason, useability is not included in the draft criteria but could be added at the discretion of the Committee and Council.

Integrity

This category considers the original site in relation to what exists today and the overall condition. The criteria can account for the extent of alterations and the current condition of buildings and structures. Buildings which have been substantially altered or relocated, or have had character-defining elements removed often have a weakened heritage value. Applications are often received because the property owner can access funding opportunities for a designated heritage property. Because condition can be improved, it is not included in the draft score sheet.

Weighting

Draft criteria based on these categories can be found in Appendix A. The weighting should be composed to prioritize the attributes which are most valued within the County. Kalman (1979) suggests assigning an arbitrary maximum score and assigning values to each category, and then individual criteria. This could include equal weighting for each criterion, equal weighting for each category, or a more nuanced approach. The draft criteria in Appendix A are based on Table 1. This weighting emphasizes historical and architectural elements, while also taking environment and integrity criteria into account. Staff evaluated several heritage properties that are currently municipally or provincially designated against these draft criteria. The mock score sheet for the LeNoir Forge is included as an example (Appendix B).

Table 1 Draft score sheet weighting.

Category	Points
History	40
Architecture	40
Environment	10
Useability	0
Integrity	10
Total	100

Conclusion:

The score sheet and scoring guide provided in Appendix A should be implemented to evaluate future municipal heritage registration requests. To expedite discussions, Staff recommend that the Planning Commission carry out the scoring, which can then be reviewed, revised as necessary, and agreed to by the Heritage Advisory Committee.

APPENDIX A: Score Sheet and Scoring Guide

**Municipal Heritage Property Score Sheet
Municipality of the County of Richmond**

Adequate information must be provided in order to adequately score each request. Where an application has information which is not submitted or cannot be located or verified, no points should be awarded. The suggested minimum score for registration is 45 points.

Property:
Comments:

Category	Criteria	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Architecture	Is the property an example of a particular architectural style?	7	
	Does the property have unique or rare exterior architectural features?	7	
	Is the property an early or unique example of a method of construction or material?	7	
	Is the property an example of impressive or unique craftsmanship or design?	7	
	Was the property designed or built by a known or significant architect or builder?	7	
	Is the building comparatively old in the context of the community?	5	
	Total	40	
History	Is the property associated with a significant person, institution, organization, or other group?	20	
	Is the property associated with the community's economic, social, cultural, political, or other type of history?	20	
	Total	40	
Environment	Does the property contribute to the character of the streetscape?	5	
	Is the property a landmark?	5	
	Total	10	
Integrity	Is the property unaltered, or are the alterations sufficiently sensitive or old that they can be considered for their own merit?	7	
	Are buildings and structures located at their original site?	3	
	Total	10	
Other (Bonus)	Are there other factors which were not captured by the criteria above?	5	
Total		100	

APPENDIX A: Score Sheet and Scoring Guide

Municipal Heritage Property Scoring Guide Municipality of the County of Richmond

Architecture 40

Is the property an example of a particular architectural style?

Excellent example of a particular style	7
Good example of a particular style	5
Common example of a particular style	3
No identifiable style	0

Does the property have unique or rare exterior architectural features?

Very rare or unique features	7
Somewhat rare or unique features	5
Common architectural features	3
Very common architectural features	0

Is the property an early or unique example of a method of construction or material?

Example of a very early or unique method or material	7
Example of a somewhat early or unique method or material	5
Common example of a particular method or material	3
Very common example of a particular method or material	0

Is the property an example of impressive or unique craftsmanship or design?

Example of very impressive or unique craftsmanship or design	7
Example of somewhat impressive or unique craftsmanship or design	5
Common example of craftsmanship or design	3
Very common example of craftsmanship or design	0

Was the property designed or built by a known or significant architect or builder?

Highly significant architect or builder	7
Somewhat significant architect or builder	5
Known architect or builder	3
Unidentified architect and builder	0

Is the building comparatively old in the context of the community?

1820 and earlier (Pre-annexation of Cape Breton)	5
1821 – 1867 (Annexation to confederation years)	4
1868 – 1913 (Post confederation years)	3
1914 – 1945 (War years)	2
1945 – Present (Post war years)	1

APPENDIX A: Score Sheet and Scoring Guide

History 40

Is the property associated with a significant person, institution, organization, or other group?

Strongly associated with primary significance	20
Loosely associated with primary significance or strongly associated with secondary significance	15
Loosely associated with secondary significance	10
Little known association	5
No known association	0

Is the property associated with the community's economic, social, cultural, political, or other type of history?

Strongly associated with primary significance	20
Loosely associated with primary significance or strongly associated with secondary significance	15
Loosely associated with secondary significance	10
Little known association	5
No known association	0

Environment 10

Does the property contribute to the character of the streetscape?

Very important in establishing character	5
Important in establishing character	3
Compatible with character	1
Incompatible with the character	0

Is the property a landmark?

Symbol for the Village, County, or wider area	5
Prominent within the community	3
Prominent within the streetscape or neighbourhood	1
Of little prominence	0

Integrity 10

Is the property unaltered, or are the alterations sufficiently sensitive or old that they can be considered for their own merit?

Unaltered, or sensitive or old alterations	7
Notable alterations, but which do not detract from the overall style	5
Some character-defining elements have been altered or removed	3
Alterations have significantly impacted the overall style	0

Are buildings and structures located at their original site?

Original site	3
Relocated, but in close proximity to original site	1
Relocated to a new site	0

Other (Bonus) 5

Are there any other factors which were not captured by the criteria above?

APPENDIX B: Score Sheet and Scoring Guide

Municipal Heritage Property Score Sheet Municipality of the County of Richmond

Adequate information must be provided in order to adequately score each request. Where an application has information which is not submitted or cannot be located or verified, no points should be awarded. The suggested minimum score for registration is 45 points.

Property: LeNoir Forge, 712 Veterans Memorial Drive, Arichat

Comments: The LeNoir Forge is valued for its historic associations with the LeNoir family and the shipbuilding industry. The building itself is also valued as an example of French style architecture and masonry. Some of the walls and roof were reconstructed but are sensitive to the overall style and original structure.

Category	Criteria	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Architecture	Is the property an example of a particular architectural style?	7	5
	Does the property have unique or rare exterior architectural features?	7	7
	Is the property an early or unique example of a method of construction or material?	7	7
	Is the property an example of impressive or unique craftsmanship or design?	7	3
	Was the property designed or built by a known or significant architect or builder?	7	3
	Is the building comparatively old in the context of the community?	5	5
	Total		40
History	Is the property associated with a significant person, institution, organization, or other group?	20	15
	Is the property associated with the community's economic, social, cultural, political, or other type of history?	20	20
	Total	40	35
Environment	Does the property contribute to the character of the streetscape?	5	3
	Is the property a landmark?	5	3
	Total	10	6
Integrity	Is the property unaltered, or are the alterations sufficiently sensitive or old that they can be considered for their own merit?	7	7
	Are buildings and structures located at their original site?	3	3
	Total	10	10
Other (Bonus)	Are there other factors which were not captured by the criteria above?	5	N/A
Total		100	81